



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,717	08/01/2001	Kenneth J. Susnjara	21195	5392

7590 05/28/2003

Peter N. Lalos
LALOS & KEEGAN
5th Floor
1146 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-3723

EXAMINER

SHENG, TOM V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

5

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,717

Applicant(s)

SUSNJARA ET AL.

Examiner

Tom V Sheng

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9, 11, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernie et al. (US Patent 5933125).

As to claims 1 and 11, Fernie teaches a virtual reality viewing system (virtual environment display apparatus; figure 2; column 4, lines 16-40) comprising:

means responsive to selective motion of a viewer operable (head position sensor 15a, head velocity sensor 15b, or head acceleration sensor 15c) to generate signals corresponding to said motions (actual head position output signal 11) providing a sequence of viewing perspectives (the steps are done repeatedly; column 2, lines 16-20);

means for projecting probable subsequent viewing perspectives that will occur in subsequent time intervals (next head or helmet position predicted by a head position processor 10 based on actual position and the measurement of the head acceleration and/or head velocity; column 4, lines 24-27);

means for generating images corresponding to said probable subsequent viewing perspectives (by the computer image generator 12); and

means for displaying said images to said viewer as current viewing perspectives (by display 20).

Fernie teaches detecting head position/orientation repeatedly as above, and since the transport delay is 100 ms (column 3, line 65, to column 4, line 2), the time interval between measurements can be as small as 100 ms, as claimed selected time intervals. Fernie does not specifically teach a means for measuring an increase in magnitude of each of said signals (actual head positions). On the other hand, it is inherent that a head position would increase over time in a certain direction as the head or helmet moves due to velocity or acceleration factors. Thus, Fernie's head position sensor inherently reads on claimed means for measuring an increase in magnitude of each of said signals at selected time intervals.

Fernie teaches predicting head position based on an actual head position and the measurement of the head acceleration and/or head velocity (column 4, lines 24-32); thus he does not teach means for generating a spline corresponding to the magnitudes of said signals at said selected time intervals. On the other hand, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize from basic Newtonian dynamics that an extrapolation slope could be determined simply based on two consecutive head positions and the respective time interval. Not necessary but advantageously, the slope would be even more accurate as the velocity and/or acceleration of the last actual head position is measured and incorporated. Thus, the slope reads on claimed spline. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fernie's predicting method by using a spline based on head positions at

Art Unit: 2673

selected time intervals only, since this would reduce cost by eliminating the use of velocity and acceleration sensors.

As to claim 2, Fernie's head position sensor 15a, head velocity sensor 15b, or head acceleration sensor 15c reads on claimed sensor means.

As to claim 6, Fernie's head position processor is inherently a computer.

As to claim 7, Fernie's sensors inherently respond to respective motions in the x, y, and z directions since the head movement is 3-dimensional in nature.

As to claim 9, Fernie's display 20 is head-mounted.

As to claims 14 and 15, the selection of time interval determines the number of samples that can be measurement within the course of a head movement (figure 1; about 400 ms). The optimal value can be empirically determined and thus not a patentively distinct feature.

3. Claims 3-5, 8, and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernie as applied to claims 1, 2, and 11 above, and further in view of Fateh et al. (US Patent 6184847 B1).

As to claims 3 and 12, Fernie is silent as to the particular nature of the sensor means. Fateh teaches a head-mounted virtual display, which includes a head-tracker that senses the direction the user is facing (column 2, lines 52-57). He further teaches that a variety of approaches can be used in head tracking (column 4, lines 38-39). He teaches the use of ultrasonic medium (column 5, lines 13-20) that reads on claimed ultrasonic sensors. Applicants also acknowledged that the different types of sensors

used for providing position information are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Fateh's ultrasonic transmitter/receiver in Fernie's invention, thus providing a proven method in head position measurement.

As to claims 4 and 13, Fateh's teaching of a magnetic sensor (column 4, lines 39-45) reads on claimed magnetic sensors.

As to claim 5, Fateh's teaching of photodiodes on the head-mounted display (column 4, lines 59-65) reads on claimed photo-optical pulse encoders.

As to claim 8, Fateh's user nodding in the forward or backward motion, downward or upward motion, or side-to-side motion read on claimed rotary and linear motion.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernie as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ishibashi et al. (US Patent 6215461 B1).

As to claim 10, rejection as to claim 1 is similarly applied. Moreover, Fernie teaches the applicability of telepresence systems, which use image sensors such as cameras mounted on head slaved gimbal system (column 5, lines 12-19). As further support, Ishibashi teaches a remote viewing system comprising claimed "a camera disposed at a site remote from a viewer, operable to train on an environment to be virtually viewed" (figure 1; camera system 1 controlled by HMD 2 for viewing the shot images SV; column 3, lines 7-24), and "means for training said camera generating

Art Unit: 2673

images corresponding to said probable subsequent viewing perspectives" (figure 5B; platform 507 supports shaft 508 to which mounted cameras may rotate up/down and rotary table 509 that may rotate laterally; column 4, lines 12-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made incorporate Ishibashi's remote viewing system into modified Fernie's viewing apparatus, thus allowing increased viewing stability by reducing latency associated between viewer head movement and update of camera image.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom V Sheng whose telephone number is (703) 305-6708. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

TS
April 28, 2003


KENT CHANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER